



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 13

**WILLIAM N. HULSEY III
HUGHES & LUCE, L.L.P.
SUITE 2800
1717 MAIN STREET
DALLAS, TX 75201**

COPY MAILED

APR 28 2004

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
Mitchell, Bradley Dale
Application No. 09/903,119
Filed: July 10, 2001
Attorney Docket No. 12522:12

ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b), filed April 19, 2004, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **granted**.

This application became abandoned for failure to timely reply within three months to the non-final Office action mailed February 27, 2003. No extensions of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Accordingly, this application became abandoned on May 28, 2003. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on December 17, 2003.

Petitioner has met the requirements to revive the above-identified application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b).

There is no indication that the person signing the instant petition was ever given a power of attorney or authorization of agent to prosecute the above-identified application. If the person signing the instant petition desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate power of attorney or authorization of agent must be submitted. While a courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the person signing the instant petition, all future correspondence will be directed solely to the address currently of record until such time as appropriate instructions are received to the contrary.

It is not apparent whether the statement of unintentional delay was signed by a person who would have been in a position of knowing that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. Nevertheless, in accordance with 37 CFR 10.18, the statement is accepted as constituting a certification of unintentional delay. However, in the event that petitioner has no knowledge that the delay was

unintentional, petitioner must make such an inquiry to ascertain that, in fact, the delay was unintentional. If petitioner discovers that the delay was intentional, petitioner must notify the Office.

The file is now being forwarded to Technology Center 2800 for further examination on the merits.

Telephone inquiries should be directed to the undersigned at (703) 306-0482.



Liana Chase
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions
Office of the Deputy Commissioner
for Patent Examination Policy

cc: DAVID B. RITCHIE
THELEN REID & PRIEST, LLP
P.O. BOX 640640
SAN JOSE, CA 95164-0640